

REMARKS

In a final Office Action dated July 26, 2004, (paper no. 14) and an Advisory Action dated December 28, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the features of claims 1, 15, 18, 21, 23, and 24 of performing (applying) Layer 2 functionality (protocol) based on whether the multimedia stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data, implies that performing Layer 2 functionality for a multimedia stream having one of audio, video, and data, for example, having audio, is different from performing Layer 2 functionality for a multimedia stream having more of audio, video, and data, for example, having more audio. The Examiner then stated that such a feature was not described in the specification at the time the application was filed. Accordingly, the Examiner contended that this step is new matter.

The applicants have amended each of claims 1, 15, 18, 21, 23 to provide for performing (applying) a different Layer 2 functionality (protocol) upon each of the plurality of decoded streams based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises audio, comprises video, or comprises data. The applicants believe that this feature, as amended, overcomes the Examiner's objection to the previously recited feature and is supported by the specification.

In particular, as provided on page 5, lines 28 to 31, of the specification, the reference to multimedia information includes at least two types of information, such as voice, video, and data. FIG. 3 and page 7, lines 9-23, of the specification then teach a codec that includes middleware 303 comprising Layer 2 functionality 325, 327, 329, 375, 377, and 379, and that further includes a voice coder 335 and decoder 365, a video coder 337 and decoder 367, and a data coder 339 and decoder 369. Page 8, lines 11-18, of the

specification then provides that at an originating end, a multimedia stream comprising one or more of voice, video, and data may be received in their component types or may be received in a multiplexed format. When received in a multiplexed format, the signal passes through a demultiplexor that splits the signal into its component parts.

FIG. 3 and page 8, line 19, to page 9, line 4, then teach that received and coded voice is routed to Layer 2 (L2) functionality 325 and then to voice coder 335, received and coded video is routed to L2 functionality 327 and then to video coder 337, and any received data is routed to L2 functionality 329 and then to data coder 339. Similarly, page 10, line 16 to page 11, line 21, of the specification provides that, at a destination end, L2 functionality 375 receives decoded voice, performs L2 functionality on the decoded voice, and conveys the decoded voice to a voice decoder 385, L2 functionality 377 receives decoded video and conveys the decoded video to a video decoder 387, and L2 functionality 379 receives decoded data and outputs a data signal 399. Therefore, whether L2 functionality 325, 327, or 329, or correspondingly L2 functionality 375, 377, or 379, is applied to the multimedia stream is based on whether the multimedia stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. Thus the specification expressly provides for an application of a different L2 functionality to, or performance of Layer 2 functionality on, each of audio, video, and data. In addition, the specification provides, on page 8, lines 5-10, that middleware 303 (which comprises the L2 functionalities, coders, and decoders), by keeping the component streams (audio, video, and data) separated, may apply optimal header compression to each such stream and may apply channel coding to the stream that is specific to the source of the stream.

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the specification supports the features of claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23 of performing (applying) a different Layer 2 functionality (protocol) or coding based on whether the multimedia stream comprises audio, comprises video, or comprises data. Accordingly, that applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23, under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and pass claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23 to allowance.

Claim 24, as amended, teaches a mobile station coupled to the network and including a plurality of multimedia ports, wherein each multimedia port of the plurality of

multimedia ports receives a multimedia stream of a plurality of multimedia streams comprising a multimedia session and routes the received multimedia stream to a different coder of a plurality of coders based on whether the multimedia stream comprises audio, comprises video, or comprises data.

With respect to claim 24, the specification further provides, on page 6, line 34, to page 7, line 8, and on page 8, lines 11-18, that the multimedia application 300 that is depicted in FIG. 3, and that is partially described above, may operate in a mobile station, which mobile station may be coupled to a computer. Page 8, lines 11-18, further provides that the component streams of a multimedia stream, that is, the voice, video, and data streams, may be multiplexed by the computer or may be in their component types when leaving the computer. With respect to the latter instance, where each component stream is separately provided by the computer to the mobile station, FIG. 3 illustrates a separate input of each component stream, that is, of voice stream 305, video stream 307, and data stream 309 to the mobile station and multimedia application 300. The received multimedia stream, that is, the component streams of the multimedia stream, is then routed to a coder of multiple coders 335, 337, and 339 based on whether the multimedia stream comprises one or more of audio (which is routed to coder 335), video (which is routed to coder 337), and data (which is routed to coder 339).

In addition, claims 24-26, as originally filed, teach a mobile station having multiple multimedia ports that is coupled to a computer having a multimedia port, which multiple multimedia ports may include a voice port, a video port, or a data port. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the specification supports the features of claim 24 of a mobile station that includes multiple multimedia ports, wherein each multimedia port of the plurality of multimedia ports receives a multimedia stream of a plurality of multimedia streams comprising a multimedia session and routes the received multimedia stream to a different coder of multiple coders based on whether the multimedia stream comprises audio, comprises video, or comprises data. Accordingly, that applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and pass claim 24 to allowance.

Since claims 2-14 depend upon allowable claim 1, claims 16 and 17 depend upon allowable claim 15, claims 19 and 20 depend upon allowable claim 18, claim 22 depends upon allowable claim 21, and claims 25-27 depend upon allowable claim 24, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 25-27 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Spear, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750